The question was taken; and (twothirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CEILING INCREASE ON FEDERAL SHARE OF WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1175) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the ceiling on the Federal share of the costs of phase I of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1175

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

SECTION 1. CEILING INCREASE ON FEDERAL SHARE OF WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT.

Section 1631(d) of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (43 U.S.C. 390h–13(d)) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (1) by striking "paragraph (2)" and inserting "paragraphs (2) and (3)";
- (2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:
- "(3) The Federal share of the costs of the project authorized by section 1624 shall not exceed the following:
 - "(A) \$22,000,000 for fiscal year 2007.
 - "(B) \$24,200,000 for fiscal year 2008.
 - "(C) \$26,620,000 for fiscal year 2009.
 - "(D) \$29,282,000 for fiscal year 2010.
 - "(E) \$32,210,200 for fiscal year 2011.
 - ((F) \$35,431,220 for fiscal year 2012.
 - "(G) \$38,974,342 for fiscal year 2013. (H) \$42,871,776 for fiscal year 2014.
 - "(I) \$47,158,953 for fiscal year 2015.
 - "(1) \$47,158,953 for fiscal year 2015. "(J) \$51,874,849 for fiscal year 2016."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. Christensen) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. Cannon) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentle-woman from the Virgin Islands.

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my friend and our colleague from California, Representative LORETTA SANCHEZ, for her dedicated and hard work on this legislation over several Congresses.

The purpose of H.R. 1175, as introduced by Ms. SANCHEZ, is to amend the

Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the Federal cost share of phase one of the Orange County, California Regional Water Reclamation Project.

The project authorized by H.R. 1175 will supplement existing water supplies by providing a new, reliable, high quality source of water to recharge the Orange County Groundwater Basin and protect it from further degradation due to seawater intrusion.

I thank Ms. SANCHEZ for her efforts on this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1175

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1175 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Democratic bill manager has adequately explained the bill. This legislation has been cosponsored by five of my Republican colleagues, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1175, a bill that I have introduced for two consecutive Congresses. I am pleased to see that the bill is on the Suspension Calendar today. I would like to thank the House leadership for making that happen.

H.R. 1175 would increase the ceiling on the federal share of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project—from \$20 million to \$51,874,849. This project will ultimately allow Orange County to complete its innovative groundwater replenishment system, which is designed to reuse advanced treated wastewater to recharge the aquifer in northern Orange County.

This aquifer is the primary source of drinking water for over 144,000 families in Orange County each year, serving about 2.3 million residents from north and central Orange County. This reclamation effort has the potential of creating a new water supply of 72,000 acre-feet per year.

The OC Groundwater Replenishment Project is an innovative program which has drawn national and international attention. Many U.S. states and foreign nations—including Japan, Korea, Taiwan—have come to Orange County to look at our tertiary cleaning system. They have observed that reusing recycled water—especially important in the arid west—will help preserve and recharge overdrawn river and groundwater supplies, and will help protect our environment from unexpected scarcity of water.

What this bill does is to increase the federal share of the project, bringing it closer to the 25 percent level, the level at which almost every other reclamation project is funded in the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act of 1992 and the Reclamation Cycling and Water Conservation Act.

The project is not just important to Orange County, California, but also to the entire western United States. By recycling our own water, we will not rely so heavily on the Colorado River Aqueduct or water from the San Francisco Bay Delta.

Members from both sides of the aisle recognize the need for this project and have been consistently supportive of this effort. I would like to thank, in particular, my colleagues from Orange County who are all original cosponsors of this bill. I appreciate their continued support for this legislation, and this important project.

Let me thank, again, the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, for his support, as well as Ranking Member YOUNG, Subcommittee Chairwoman NAPOLITANO and Ranking Member MCMORRIS for their overwhelming support of H.R. 1175.

Finally, let me thank Denis Bilodeau, Irv Pickler, Virginia Grebbien, Philip Anthony, Craig Miller, and everyone affiliated with the Orange County Water District and Orange County Sanitation District for their hard work and leadership in groundwater treatment and recycling. Their innovation has put Orange County at the forefront of water recycling and groundwater replenishment technology. I thank them for all they continue to do for Orange County.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I vield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. Christensen) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1175.

The question was taken; and (twothirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES CONSERVA-TION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 361) to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and activities under that Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 361

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES UNDER THE LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ADDITIONAL PROJECTS.—Section 4(a) of the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-576; 114 Stat. 3067) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(20) In Cameron County, Texas, Bayview Irrigation District No. 11, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March 3, 2004, engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of \$1.425.210